

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-44 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Support for the amendment is found in the specification, no new matter has been added. Claims 2-4 and 6-44 remain unchanged.

Claims 1-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,058,389 (issued 2 May 2000) to Chandra et al. Applicants respectfully submit that “for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.” MPEP 706.02.

1. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over Chandra. Applicants further submit that Chandra teaches one information queue record per message for all consumers, whereas an element of amended claim 1 recites “history record for each consumer for each information record comprising data to be provided to each said consumer.” In other words, a history record exists for each consumer, per message that the specific consumer is to access. For example, if message MSG1 were to be accessed by 12 consumers, there would be 12 history records - one record for each consumer for message MSG1.

Chandra shows one information record for all consumers in the following passage.

A queue table 200 holds a set of queues, and each queue table 200 is implemented as a database table within the relational database system 300. Each queue table 200 can contain multiple queues 202, 204 each having multiple queue messages 208. In one embodiment, a queue table 200 is structured as shown in FIG. 2. Each row of the queue table 200 represents a message 208 in a queue 202, 204. Some of the columns in a queue table 200 are meta-data describing a queue 202, 204. In one embodiment, each row of the queue table 200 has the following columns:

Column	Contents
QUEUE	Queue name
MSG_ID	Message identifier
CORR_ID	User-provided correlation identifier
MSG_PRIORITY	Message priority
MSG_STATE	State of the message (READY to be

DELAY	processed, DELAYED, PROCESSED, or EXPIRED) Time after which the message will be ready to be processed
EXPIRATION	Message expiration time in seconds
TIME_MANAGER_INFO	Date used by time manager process to monitor messages
LOCAL_ORDER_NO	Local order number of message
CHAIN_NO	Chain number of message
DSCN	Dependent transaction number
CSCN	Commit transaction number
ENQ_TIME	Original enqueue time
ENQ_USER_ID	User identifier for the user who enqueued the message
ENQ_TXN_ID	Current transaction identifier
DEQ_TIME	Time when the message was dequeued
DEQ_TXN_ID	Transaction which performed the dequeue
DEQ_USER_ID	User id of the user who dequeued the message ...
USER_DATA	User data for use by an application or process

Column 7, lines 4-40, 45-47 (emphasis added).

Note that the single information record includes a MSG_ID to identify the message, a ENQ_USER_ID to identify the user who enqueued the message, and an DEQ_USER_ID to identify the user who dequeued the message. However, this one single record includes both the ENQ_USER_ID and the DEQ_USER_ID, not separate records for each consumer. Further, even if there were two separate information records for one message for each of the ENQ_USER_ID and the DEQ_USER_ID, the two records would only identify two consumers, the ones who enqueued or dequeued the message, not each and every user who is to access, or has accessed, the message.

Applicants further submit that the CORR_ID does not provide a method to identify a consumer of the message. For example, Chandra discloses “The correlation identifier is a value that identifies a message” Column 13, lines 31-32. Further, Chandra discloses: “In step 950, the process reads all the parameter values. In step 952, the process evaluates whether the

Message Identifier value or the Correlation Identifier value is provided. If a valid Message Identifier exists , then in step 954 the process selects a message from the named queue based upon the Message Identifier. If a valid Correlation Identifier exists, then in step 956 the process selects a message from the named queue based upon the Correlation Identifier.” Column 18, lines 37-44, Figure 9B, elements 950 - 956. Therefore, Chandra does not disclose amended claim 1 as recited:

A method for managing information to be accessed by multiple consumers, said information comprising one or more information records, said information records to be accessed by said multiple consumers in a specified order, each said information record comprising data to be accessed by a consumer, said method comprising: providing said data of an information record to a consumer; and updating a history table, said history table comprising a history record for each consumer for each information record comprising data to be provided to each said consumer, wherein each said history record comprising a message state field a, said updating comprising setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data.

Amended claim 1 (emphasis added).

Claims 2-12 depend on claim 1 and are patentable over Chandra for at least these reasons.

2. As per claim 13 the Office action states on page 7, lines 1-13 that Chandra discloses the elements of claim 13. However, Chandra discloses:

A queue table 200 holds a set of queues, and each queue table 200 is implemented as a database table within the relational database system 300. Each queue table 200 can contain multiple queues 202, 204 each having multiple queue messages 208. In one embodiment, a queue table 200 is structured as shown in FIG. 2. Each row of the queue table 200 represents a message 208 in a queue 202, 204. Some of the columns in a queue table 200 are meta-data describing a queue 202, 204. DEQ_USER_ID User id of the user who dequeues the message Column 7, lines 4-12, and 40.

Chandra further discloses:

Transactions can create messaging using ENQUEUE operation and consume messages by using a DEQUEUE operation. Messages are selected for consumption based upon the control information stored with the message.

Column 6, lines 60-63.

Applicants respectfully submit that the queue table of Chandra is used to read on both the information queue and a table separated from said information queue. For example, the Office action states “An information queue (queue table)” and “A table (each queue table) separated from said information queue” on page 7, lines 3, 7 (emphasis added).

Applicants further submit that Chandra teaches only one information record per message. For example Chandra discloses “An application can specify that messages shall be retained in a queue after consumption.... The system stores information about the history of each message,” Column 10, lines 28-29, 31-32 (emphasis added). A message that is “retained in a queue” indicates it stays within the same container. Further Chandra discloses “Still another advantage of the disclosed system is coordinated recovery. According to the invention, a single transaction log is maintained.” Column 36, lines 23-25 (emphasis added). As Chandra clearly teaches one table for both information record and history, Chandra does not disclose claim 13 as recited:

A system for the delivery of information to multiple consumers, said system comprising: an information queue comprising one or more information queue records, each said information queue records comprising information to the accessed by one or more consumers; and a table separate from said information queue comprising one or more records, each said table record comprising an identification of said information in an information queue record each said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of one of said one or more consumers.

Claim 13 (emphasis added).

Claims 14-20, and 27 depend on claim 13 and are patentable over Chandra for at least the above reasons.

3. Claim 21 is substantially similar to claim 13 and is patentable over Chandra for at least the same reasons as presented for claim 13. Claims 22 depends on claim 21 and is patentable over Chandra for at least the same reasons.

4. Per claims 23, 31, and 38 the Office action states:

The applicant argues that “Chandra does not disclose, teach, or suggest a method comprising [indicating] in a second location that said first consumer has

accessed said first piece of information and indicating in a third location that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information.”

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. Chandra suggests “it is preferable for the Queue table to maintain a reference count of the applications that have a pointer to a particular message from the index, that is, applications for which message is in the current view. ... When the reference count reaches zero, the message is either deleted or archived.” (col. 20, lines 41-49). This suggests that the second application access the message according to the pointer wherein the pointer is the reference location of the message wherein the reference pointer is also the third location for the second application to be accessed.

Office action dated 23 March 2004, page 4, line 19 through page 5, line 8.

The Office action correctly states “This suggests that the second application access the message according to the pointer wherein the pointer is the reference location of the message wherein the reference pointer is also the third location for the second application to be accessed.” In other words, the single pointer is the reference location for both the second application and the third application. However, applicants submit that a single pointer as a reference location for both the second and third application is not in the claimed limitations. An element of the claim recites “indicating in a second location that said first consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating in a third location that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information.” However, Chandra teaches:

In this embodiment, it is preferable for the Queue Table to maintain a reference count of the applications that have a pointer to a particular message from the index, that is, applications for which a message is within the current view. When a message is dequeued by an application, the corresponding index entry is deleted from the queue table index and the reference count of the message in the queue table is decremented. When the reference count reaches zero, the message is either deleted or archived.

Column 20, lines 41-49.

Applicants submit that Chandra discloses a single reference counter for each message that is decremented each time a consumer dequeues the message. For example, Chandra discloses “When a message is dequeued by an application, the corresponding index entry is deleted from the queue table index and the reference count of the message in the queue table is decremented.” in column 20, lines 44-47. However, this single reference counter does not teach a second location and a third location, or more specifically, “indicating in a second location that said first

consumer has accessed said first piece of information; providing access to said first piece of information to a second consumer of said multiple consumers; and indicating in a third location that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information.” as recited in an element of claims 23, 31, and 38.

Claims 24-30, 32-36, and 39-44 depend from claims 23, 31, and 38 respectively, and are patentable over Chandra for at least the same reasons as claims 23, 31, and 38.

In summary, Applicants submit that Chandra does not disclose the elements of claims 1-44. Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the reference to teach every aspect of the claimed invention. As such, applicants respectfully submit that Chandra cannot preclude patentability of claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above amendment and remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: May 26, 2004

By: Janet D. Chance
Janet D. Chance
Reg. No. 55,048

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4904
Telefax: (650) 849-4800